

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

This response is submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed August 27, 2003, to request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-15 as set forth therein. In the event the Examiner determines that the foregoing amendments do not place the case in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the above amendments be entered to place the claims in better form for consideration on appeal.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Japanese Publication No. 08-163038 to Shinji et al. (hereinafter "Shinji"). Claims 2, 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Shinji. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Shinji in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,799 to Hu et al. (hereinafter "Hu"). Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Shinji in view of Japanese Publication No. 63-189924 to Kenji (hereinafter "Kenji"). Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Shinji in view of Hu in further view of Kenji. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Shinji in view of Japanese Publication No. 02-235499 to Yoshikazu (hereinafter "Yoshikazu"). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Shinji in view of Kenji and further in view of Yoshikazu. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Shinji in view of Hu in further view of Kenji in further view of Yoshikazu.

In the previous response to the Official Action of March 13, 2003, Applicant argued that the present invention teaches a wireless keyboard that solves the problem experienced by

wireless keyboards that consume a high amount of electricity because they transmit the radio signal from the wireless keyboard at a fixed level (usually the maximum level) at all times, and that this was accomplished by switching a predetermined transmission level of an input signal, depending on the transmission level of the input signal, and on the reception level in the receiving means, resulting in less consumption of electricity.

However, the Examiner, on page 13 in the present Final Office Action, alleges that Shinji does teach this limitation, and quotes a paragraph from Shinji: “Therefore, according to the wireless input unit of this invention, when the two-way communication by the wireless lightwave signal is not materialized in the number of times continuation of specification, or addition, a large use range can be taken by changing the amount of drive current supplied to a light-emitting part article one by one”. The Examiner interprets this to mean that Shinji is capable of a wide range of transmission levels dependent on the transmission and reception level on each end.

However, merely changing the drive current is not equal to switching a transmission level of an input signal dependent on a combination of both the transmission level and the reception level. Shinji only teaches changing the amount of drive current when the wireless lightwave signal does not materialize.

Applicant respectfully submits that Shinji fails to teach switching a transmission level of an input signal dependent on a combination of both the transmission level and the reception level. However, due to the finality of the Office Action, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 2, 3 and 13 to further distinguish the present invention over the cited reference. Specifically, the independent claims have been amended to recite that the predetermined transmission level is increased, decreased or maintained dependent on a combination of both the

transmission level and the reception level, instead of being “switched”. This allows for less consumption of electricity, depending on the level of the transmission and the reception.

Support for the claims is found throughout the specification; specifically, in Figs. 4 and 5, and on page 13, line 16 – page 15, line 11. Therefore, no new matter has been added by way of the amendment to the claims. Additionally, Applicant submits that “increasing, decreasing or maintaining” the transmission level is equivalent to the transmission level being “switched”; Applicant simply amended the claims to ensure that the Examiner understood the Applicant’s argument. Therefore, no new issues are raised by way of the amendment to the claims; therefore, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment to the claims.

As taught in the specification, and shown in Figs. 4 and 5, allowable minimum range for the transmission level and the reception level to be transmitted and received between the information processing device 2 and the wireless keyboard 1 are divided into 3 levels of a short, a medium and a long range according to a relation between the transmission level and the reception level.

For example, as shown in Fig. 4, the transmission level is high at the initial value and a first input data is accordingly output at high level. Then the information processing device 2 determines the reception level. If the reception level returns to the keyboard 1 at a low level, the information processing device 2 sets a new transmission level at high by combining the transmission level at high and the reception level at low; thereby increasing the transmission level. For another example, when the transmission level is high and the reception level is high as shown in Fig. 4, a new transmission level is set at low; thereby decreasing the transmission level.

Thus, the distance information between the information processing device 2 and the wireless keyboard 1 is detected according to the relation between the transmission level and the reception level. The allowable minimum transmission level for the information processing device 2 to be received and detected normally is set. Accordingly, it is possible to reduce undesired power consumption by transmitting radio signal at a fixed level (high level).

Applicant respectfully submits that the references cited by the Examiner, either individually or in combination, fail to teach the predetermined transmission level being increased, decreased or maintained dependent on a combination of both the transmission level and the reception level, as recited in independent claims 1, 2, 3 and 13. As the dependent claims recite additional unique elements and/or limitations, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims remain patentable.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 13 and 14, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 2, 9 and 15, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 3 and 10, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 11, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 5 and 12, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 6, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 7, and the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 8.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.

Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

PJE:AVS:jap